

**HUMAN AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS (HSD)
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS MEETING 2005**

September 15-16, 2005

**Evaluation Form
Compiled Comments**

OVERALL HSD MEETING

	4= Strongly Agree		1= Strongly Disagree	
	4	3	2	1
1. This meeting was scientifically useful to me. I learned a lot. <i>Total Responses: 32</i> Average: 3.22	12	16	3	1
2. I met new people with whom I would like to work. <i>Total Responses: 32</i> Average: 3.47	18	12	1	1
3. I learned useful information about NSF and other agencies supporting the social and behavioral sciences. <i>Total Responses: 32</i> Average: 3.5	17	14	1	0
4. I felt the meeting was productive use of my time. <i>Total Responses: 31</i> Average: 3.42	16	12	3	0

SCIENTIFIC SESSIONS

	4= Excellent		1= Poor	
	4	3	2	1
1. Quality of scientific presentations <i>Total Responses: 32</i> Average: 3.38	15	14	3	0
2. Appropriateness of scheduling and format <i>Total Responses: 30</i> Average: 3.17	10	16	3	1

Which session(s) did you find most useful and why?

1. One power pt. slide is not sufficient for rapid-fire presentation – how about 3-4 slides.
2. International panel. Finding out programs abroad.
3. 3 min rapid-fire sessions. – gives good breadth.
4. Breakout sessions – more time for question, answer and exchange.
5. - rapid fire – educated me on the range of research
- poster sessions – great opportunity to meet other
- Breakouts – good questions.
6. Rapid fire pres.
7. Poster sessions

9. Research infrastructure
Introduce powerful tools for social research
11. Rapid fire presentations, because they balance content with overview.
12. Rapid fire in other disciplines helpful
in my own not as helpful
13. Breakout sessions – Flexible discussions. Contact with NSF officers
14. Rapid fire, show overview of everybody's research
15. All were fine.
16. The session on international research + methods
18. Plenary / 3 minute rapid fire presentations
19. Contacts with others
20. Breakout Groups
21. Project Presentations
22. No difference between the sessions really.
23. 1. Project presentations;
2. Infrastructure;
3. International.
24. Liked poster sessions
25. Infrastructure panel was great.
26. Rapid – fire presentations – gave brief overview such that I could follow up if desired, but not long
if something less interesting to me
27. Panels provided more opportunity for sustained focus on a topic, as did breakout sessions
28. 3 minute presentation – I found the projects with which I could collaborate
29. All
30. Poster session.
3 minute presentations – intellectually stimulating; exposure to new areas
31. Breakout sessions useful in elaborating some questions that I have had using rapporteurs to
report to the whole group was very useful
32. Group sessions with time to interact & reflect.

Which session(s) did you find least useful and why?

1. ?
3. Liked them all.
4. Rapid fire presentations – the format of the presentations was useful but the length of the sessions
themselves made the summaries more like sound bites and were somewhat tiresome
5. NA
7. I'd call the scientific presentations weak because 3 mins is not enough time to say anything useful.
However, it was an effective way to whet our appetite for projects before poster sessions.
8. SGER
11. Breakout sessions, because not clear what mandate was.
13. Posters – No really discussions -
14. International panel, not directly clear how USA participants can get involved.
16. The one hour poster session – that can be shorter and broken up into 2-20 minute break
sessions.
18. Small number of presenters struggled with 3 minute time limit
19. Scientific exchange, esp[ecially] in area of nish [niche]assessment
20. SGER Panel
21. Breakouts
- Too many
- Not enough time to develop topics
23. The poster session. Little opportunity to discuss with PIs.

25. Keynote – interesting but probably too focused on specific problem
26. Poster sessions – would have been better if after rapid- fire, people in that session available for discussions / round table
27. Rapid fire format while perhaps a necessary evil was inhibitive of audience engagement & depth on part of the presenter
28. None
29. – No
30. Lunch sessions. Not sure much came out of them that was useful
31. 3 min. presentations were very hectic – I understand why they were used, but it was only a sampling. The good news is that the poster sessions allowed follow up
32. Rapid fire with no time for discussion

What changes would you suggest for scientific sessions at future PI meetings?

1. Breakout sessions that focus on individual investigators projects. Investigators could discuss informally about their work.
2. Include other U.S. government + international government observers.
3. more in-depth project presentations
4. Especially with more presentations, you might consider breaking them up into smaller groups and providing more time for question and answer.
5. – more time to interact w/ NSF reps.
6. drop 1 – slide rule – 3-minute rule is adequate & 1-slide rule led to illegible slide
7. Perhaps force everyone to make posters. (I didn't)
& schedule posters following corresponding sessions. (to focus on follow up of session)
8. Not sure, too much to really absorb
9. More international participants.
12. free + networking at lunch
13. Emphasis on methods – tools that could be applied to other disciplines.
16. The Rapid fire sessions should be 5 mins vs. 3.
There should be break out sessions around the projects themselves – perhaps grouping project along multiple dimensions like methods, or discipline, context, etc.
18. Status quo okay.
20. Require posters
21. Longer time for project reports
22. Far too many presentations – re-organize so that there's more time for discussion.
23. Very little. 5 minutes rather than 3.
24. Cannot keep doing 3-minute presentations when # of projects expands
25. More on managing inter-disciplinary projects – data, methods, students, making projects work.
26. See above comment
27. Perhaps cluster PIs by focus & have panels of like-(ish) scientists present together, vs. the rapid fire format
28. 3 minute rule is fine but let people use more than one PowerPoint slide. Those who broke the rule were more effective.
29. No
30. Allow maybe 5 min ea[ch]
31. With more time on the grants in force, ask PIs to present one key finding → turn that into a press release or series of connected press releases.
32. Streams of mechanically worked presentations over discussions.

Presentations and Panels

	4= Excellent 4	3	2	1= Poor 1
1. Keynote presentation <i>Total Responses: 28</i> Average: 3.46	17	8	2	1
2. SGER panel <i>Total Responses: 25</i> Average: 3.24	9	13	3	0
3. International panel <i>Total Responses: 28</i> Average: 3.11	6	20	1	1
4. Infrastructure panel <i>Total Responses: 23</i> Average: 3.30				
Comments:				
22. The keynote was just an expanded rapid-fire. The International panel was platitudes + rapid-fire.	10	11	1	1
26. Filling this out prior to infrastructure panel, so no comment on that				
27. Panel format allows for more focused & sustained discussion				
31. The overall quality of panels was very good & many the best I have attended				

Breakout Sessions

	4= Excellent 4	3	2	1= Poor 1
1. Quality of breakout session 1 <i>Total Responses: 25</i> Average: 3.52	13	12	0	0
2. Quality of breakout session 2 <i>Total Responses: 23</i> Average: 3.26	7	15	1	0
3. Appropriateness of scheduling and format <i>Total Responses: 25</i> Average: 3.36	11	12	2	0

Please comment on the selection of issues for discussion.

1. Add more breakouts centered on individual investigators' projectors.
2. appropriate.
7. They seemed useful to NSF, so I'm not concerned that some weren't so useful to me
9. Pretty good

- 15. Good.
- 16. See comments on pg 1 on sessions organized by project.
- 18. Great.
- 20. Excellent
- 21. Topics were fine / time was too short
- 22. Very good set of issues.
- 23. I had separate meetings so I could not take part in these.
- 25. Pretty good but more on sharing ideas for project management
- 26. Might generate more discussion if reports immediately follow session
- 27. Good – addressed many areas of concern
- 28. Good
- 31. Offered a wide range of topics – I would have liked to attend all of them!
- 32. Fine

What issues would you like to see discussed at future PI meetings?

- 2. Knowledge into action. Communicating results of research to public & official & media audience.
- 3. Drawing in more collaboration with CISE / Engineering.
- 4. Integrating research with professional advancement / developing venues for multidisciplinary work
- 6. Breakout session I, org. around environment & this was more useful than
- 9. More imaginative topic, such as digitalization and its effect on human beings.
- 15. Not necessarily for this group
- 18. See 2 boxes below.
- 20. Other funding opportunities. Integration with other (non-NSF) programs.
- 22. Some more substantive research questions would be useful.
- 23. Scope for international cooperation.
- 25. Pretty good but more on sharing ideas for project management
- 26. The review process, selection of panelists/reviewers for interdisciplinary grants.
- 27. Coordinating multi-site, multiple – PI projects – this is a real managerial challenge for which PIs may have precious little training. Also promotions gender & racial / ethnic inclusiveness in science.
- 31. Ethics of research. Cross cultural and international comparative.

Please comment on the inclusiveness, openness, and productivity of discussions.

- 3. No complaints.
- 4. Very good
- 5. Very good. Encourages allows / Promotes – PI interactions.
- 6. Very good
- 8. People were quite open & receptive & constructive
- 9. Very good
- 15. Good
- 18. Great.
- 20. Very good. No problems
- 21. Excellent
- 22. Need more discussions, but these were good.
- 23. Excellent atmosphere, open, friendly.
- 25. Very inclusive
- 26. Good on all fronts

27. Great – I was particularly glad to have NSF officers as facilitators as it signals that the outcomes of these sessions will feed back into future rounds of funding
31. Would like more ability to go between breakout sessions to sample more.
32. Not enough

What changes would you suggest for breakout discussions at future PI meetings?

2. Some sessions on problem issues.
3. Provide a set of questions to structure discussions
6. Topical
9. More relax[ed]
16. More breakout sessions, less presentations and panels.
18. More emphasis on basic/applied science linkages, ways to promote/sell with/to proactive communities
21. Fewer topics – longer discussions.
22. In general, they were fine. Some idea of what use would be made of the discussions would have been nice.
26. Giving a talk disseminating interdisciplinary research.
27. Don't combine lunch & work – it's hard to be professional with lettuce in one's teeth, so most of us end up doing a sub-optimal job of both meeting & eating.
31. OK as is
32. Do not have a breakout as me last sessions.

Posters and Networking

	4= Excellent 4	3	2	1= Poor 1
1. Did the poster sessions provide effective discussion? <i>Total Responses: 28</i> Average: 3.25	11	14	2	1
2. Was ample time provided for each of the poster sessions? <i>Total Responses: 28</i> Average: 3.36	11	16	1	0
3. Were networking opportunities with other PIs adequate? <i>Total Responses: 27</i> Average: 3.26	13	9	4	1
4. Were networking opportunities with NSF staff adequate? <i>Total Responses: 28</i> Average: 3.04	8	13	7	0

Comments:

1. I wish NSF staff did not have to leave – several who I wanted to talk to only attended one morning or one afternoon.
5. There could have been more time available for meeting w/ staff.
7. This was a fantastic interdisciplinary networking opportunity
16. Too much time for poster session. Announcements should be made/reminders about poster & presenters.

20. NSF staff in and out
 22. The keynote was just an expanded rapid-fire. The international panel was platitudes + rapid – fire.
 25. I think it would be better to make posters mandatory – particularly if you plan to stick w/ the 3 minute presentations
 26. Poster sessions lacked organization/structure that could have further facilitated networking
 27. There's actually a lot of networking that goes on informally. The meeting was perhaps over-structured, w/ too few breaks. Next time, consider providing longer / off-site breaks – the networking will happen.
 31. I would like to see more attendance of them. When I was there, attendance was spotty
 32. Did not attend.

Logistics

	4= Excellent 4	3	2	1= Poor 1
1. Pre-meeting communications <i>Total Response: 29</i> Average: 3.35	13	13	3	0
2. Meeting registration process <i>Total Response: 29</i> Average: 3.48	16	11	2	0
3. Usefulness of meeting website <i>Total Response: 27</i> Average: 3	7	13	7	0
4. Usefulness of printed meeting materials <i>Total Response: 28</i> Average: 3.43	13	14	1	0
5. Quality of hotel services <i>Total Response: 25</i> Average: 2.64	5	8	10	2
6. Quality of NSF meeting facilities <i>Total Response: 28</i> Average: 3.5	17	9	1	1
7. Event Management Staff (EDJ) <i>Total Response: 28</i> Average: 3.5	15	12	1	0

What changes would you suggest for logistics at future PI meeting?

2. Allow observers without registration fee.
 6. Put all logistics in one document
 14. Better info on expectation presentations
 16. At the end of each session someone should come up to the podium and say “we’ve just concluded X and now we’re moving to Y” to better direct attendees & itinerary & flow.
 20. Hotel reservations should be part of registration for the meeting

- 22. The meeting room was just terrible – couldn't see the screen or hear questions. Why such an expensive hotel when you force us to pay our own way?
- 25. Hotel was expensive and too far from NSF
- 26. EDJ helpful on a general and personal level (screwed up hotel). Would have been helpful to have chart of various deadlines for quick reference
- 27. People complained a lot about the food, though I didn't find it that bad. Future meetings might reserve space in a nearby restaurant for the networking dinner – provides a break for us all, alcohol for those who wish, and at least the perception of choice/better quality of refreshments.
- 31. Closer hotel – party to open the meeting!
- 32. None.

General Suggestions and Comments:

- 2. Overall, very valuable & mind-expanding. I very much enjoyed participating. Congratulations to NSF for making this happen!
- 7. could have better prepared us for the laptop network security issues
- 8. For me, & I may be quite unusual There were a few important nuggets, but a pretty low return on a pretty long time investment. But again, this may be Idiosyncratic. I did make two important contacts/ otherwise would not have made for which I am quite grateful. I like the idea of topical breakouts.
- 11. The substantive spread of HSD program was impressive, but there was much more of a convergence of environmentally oriented projects than I had anticipated.
- 18. Good event.
- 21. Overall, this was an excellent program to be a part of.
- 22. Organize sets of panels by general theme – don't do a series of show and tells on specific projects – we can go to find out about projects after we discover commonalities.
- 23. Overall, an excellent and stimulating event.
- 24. Great meeting.
- 25. If you keep the 3-min presentations then make posters mandatory
I found the networking opportunities MUCH better and more productive than I expected. Number of attendees was very comfortable.
- 26. Overall worth time and effort in my opinion
- 27. Thanks for organizing this. It was good to meet the other PIs, network with them & NSF officers, and hear (too briefly) about some fantastic research projects. My main suggestion involves moving toward a panel format for the PIs to provide for more sustained & focused discussion.
- 32. Very worthwhile overall. Thank you.